

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LUFKIN DIVISION**

REBECCA A. MOORMAN

V.

**CAROLYN L. COLVIN,
Commissioner of Social
Security Administration**

§
§
§
§
§
§

NO. 9:14-CV-26

**ORDER OVERRULING PLAINTIFF’S OBJECTIONS AND
ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Plaintiff requests judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security Administration with respect to her application for disability-based benefits. The court referred this matter to the Honorable Zack Hawthorn, United States Magistrate Judge, at Beaumont, Texas, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of this court. The magistrate judge submitted a report recommending that the court affirm the Commissioner’s decision.

The court considered the report and recommendation filed on June 18, 2015 (Doc. No. 29) and the Plaintiff’s objections filed on July 2, 2015 (Doc. No. 30). A party who files timely written objections to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation is entitled to a *de novo* determination of those findings or recommendations to which the party specifically objects. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c) (Supp. IV 2011); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2)-(3). “Parties filing objections must specifically identify those findings [to which they object]. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections need not be considered by the district court.” Nettles v. Wainwright, 677 F.2d 404, 410 n.8 (5th Cir. 1982) (en banc), overruled on other grounds by Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n, 79 F.3d 1412 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

Moorman, who is represented by counsel, states in her objections that she “reasserts the arguments in her Brief and Reply Brief.” (Doc. No. 30.) She then states the law for evaluating a disability claim and lists three headings, which merely reiterate three issues from her previous brief. She does not make any arguments under these headings other than that the magistrate judge committed legal error in his analysis of each issue. These objections are general and conclusory and need not be considered by the district court. See Nettles, 677 F.2d at 410. However, out of an abundance of caution, the court has conducted a *de novo* review of the purported objections in relation to the pleadings and the applicable law. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). After careful review, the court concludes that the Plaintiff’s objections are without merit.

Accordingly, the court **ADOPTS** the magistrate judge’s recommendation, **OVERRULES** the Plaintiff’s objections, and **AFFIRMS** the Commissioner’s denial of benefits. A final judgment will be entered in this case in accordance with the magistrate judge’s recommendation.

It is SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 10th day of July, 2015.


MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE